

Message

From: LEE, LILY [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=D6085A744F9347E6836C54C0E85B97B2-LLEE06]
Sent: 5/4/2018 4:16:54 PM
To: Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N [matthew.slack@navy.mil]
Subject: FW: FYI - story for Friday 5/4 Media query (DDL: 3 pm) - SF Chronicle - HPNS Parcel A
Attachments: Rad Scanner Van Survey Rpt Sept 2002 09-156344.pdf; Parcel UC-2 RACR - excerpt re excavation of slope.pdf; Dean email 2004-7-20 - HPNS322 Draft Final.pdf

From: LEE, LILY

Sent: Thursday, May 3, 2018 9:05 AM

To: 'Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO' <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Bill Franklin (william.d.franklin@navy.mil) <william.d.franklin@navy.mil>; kellie.koenig@ch2m.com; 'Henderson, Kim/SDO' <Kimberly.Henderson@CH2M.com>; 'Elizabeth Basinet' <elizabeth.basinet@NOREASINC.COM>; 'McKinney, Kasheica (CII)' <kasheica.mckinney@sfgov.org>; Amy Brownell (amy.brownell@sfdph.org) <amy.brownell@sfdph.org>; 'juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov' <juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>; george.brooks@navy.mil; 'Janda, Danielle L CIV' <danielle.janda@navy.mil>

Subject: FYI - story for Friday 5/4 Media query (DDL: 3 pm) - SF Chronicle - HPNS Parcel A

FYI, from my press officer:

Good morning,

SF Chronicle reporters Cynthia Dizikes and Jason Fagone are working on a story about Hunter's Point and Parcel A that may be published as soon as Friday. They are hoping to get answers to the questions below by 3pm today.

Background from reporters:

We understand that the EPA removed Parcel A from the Superfund list in 1999. Parcel A was then transferred to the city in 2004, and given a clean bill of health based on surveys and cleanup performed by the Navy, the EPA and Tetra Tech. That work included the use of an EPA scanner van to survey Parcel A in 2002 and verify that radiation detected was not above naturally occurring levels.

In 2016, the agency said in a factsheet that it had "no reason to question any cleanup work performed on parcel A."

We've spoken to multiple sources, including two former technicians who worked at Hunter's Point, who call into question the effectiveness and validity of the 2002 EPA scanner van survey. They tell us that the van was inadequate to the task -- that it was never able to survey the entire surface of Parcel A, contrary to the EPA's past claims, and that the equipment on the van was blind to some isotopes of concern on the site, including plutonium-239 and strontium-90. Also, the van traversed parts of the site (not Parcel A) that were later found to be radioactive, and the van never registered elevated readings for those areas. Our sources said scanner vans like the one used in Parcel A should only be used as a first pass for this type of work and should be followed by extensive handheld scanning and soil sampling.

Two former Tetra Tech employees also have said that following the van scan, they obtained samples from Parcel A that had higher than expected levels of radioactivity. One case involved samples taken from manholes in Parcel A around February 2004 that tested high for radium-226. The other case, which is detailed in the NRC petition, involves a former employee, Anthony Smith, who said he found a high level of cesium-137 in Parcel A in

2009. In that petition, Smith said that another Tetra Tech employee told him to “get rid of it and not say a word.”

We additionally understand that Tetra Tech was responsible for some cleanup on Parcel A, including filling excavated areas with soil they said was clean.

Given these points, we would like to get your response to the following:

Q1: Do you still maintain that the EPA’s 2002 scanner van results are meaningful? Was it reasonable for the EPA to rely in part on the scanner van results in its decision to approve the transfer of Parcel A to San Francisco? (In a 2016 fact sheet on Parcel A, the EPA listed the 2002 scanner van survey as one reason that led to the EPA’s approval of the transfer.)

Q2: It’s our understanding that there will now be resampling of parcels, and that Parcel A is not included. Given the allegations from the whistleblowers, and concerns about the inadequacy of the 2002 EPA scanner van survey of Parcel A, should a comprehensive soil survey for radiation now be conducted on Parcel A? If not, why not?

Q3: Specifically, have you followed up on the claim of Anthony Smith that he found a hot cesium sample on Parcel A? Should that specific location on Parcel A be tested for radiation and/or remediated?

Q4: There is a commercial kitchen close to the location where Smith says he took the hot cesium sample. Are you concerned about this, from a safety standpoint? Should the public be concerned? Should the owners and clients of the kitchen be concerned? If not, why not?

Q5: There are construction crews who have recently worked on Parcel A without protective gear to prevent radiation exposure. Should they be concerned about possible exposure to radioactive materials? Should the people they come into contact with, such as their families, be concerned? If not, why not?

Q6: Do you still have confidence in the work that Tetra Tech did on Parcel A cleanup, including its remediation of radiological contamination in a handful of buildings (322, 816, etc) and its replacement of excavated soil with backfill they said was clean?

Q7: We have been told by a former Hunter’s Point technician that he took a walk near the site in February of this year and observed the site through binoculars for an hour. He said he saw a dump truck digging up loads of wet slushy material from the shoreline at the border of Parcel E/Parcel F, then driving the material to a hillside on or near Parcel A and dumped the material on the hill. Our source says there was no radiation control of the truck as it moved from a potentially contaminated part of the site (Parcel E/F) to Parcel A. Are you aware of any similar breakdowns in radiation protocol at the site right now? Have you investigated any such breakdowns?